



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

[Handwritten signature]
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/613,363	07/03/2003	Milan N. Stojanovic	66710-A/JPW/PJP	7249
7590	02/01/2006		EXAMINER	
Cooper & Dunham LLP 1185 Avenue of the Americas New York, NY 10036				DEJONG, ERIC S
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		1631		

DATE MAILED: 02/01/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/613,363	STOJANOVIC, MILAN N.	
	Examiner Eric S. DeJong	Art Unit 1631	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>02/13/2004</u> and <u>11/66/2003</u> | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. |

DETAILED OFFICE ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

The listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement (see pages 12-14 of the instant specification). 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609.04(a) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." Therefore, unless the references have been cited by the examiner on form PTO-892, they have not been considered.

SEQUENCE COMPLIANCE

This application contains sequence disclosures that are encompassed by the definitions for nucleotide and /or amino acid sequences set forth in CFR § 1.821(a)(1) and (a)(2). See for example Figures 2A and 3. However, this application fails to comply with the requirements of CFR § 1.821 through 1.825 because it lacks a submission of a computer readable form sequence listing, a paper copy for the specification, a statement under CFR § 1.821(f) and (g), and SEQ ID numbers cited along with each sequence in the specification or Figures. Applicants are also reminded that SEQ ID numbers are not required in the Figures per se, however, the corresponding SEQ ID numbers then are required in the Brief Description of the Drawings section in the specification. Applicants are also reminded that a CD_ROM sequence listing

submission may replace the paper and computer readable form sequence listing copies. Applicants are given the same response time regarding this failure to comply as that set forth to respond to this office action. Failure to respond to this requirement may result in abandonment of the instant application or a notice of a failure to fully respond to this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-18, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is not supported by either a specific and substantial asserted utility or a well established utility. This rejection is newly applied.

The specification of the disclosure asserts several applications and uses of the instant claimed macromolecular assembly. In summary, the claimed invention is an assembly comprising catalytic nucleic acid leg units which catalyze an nucleic acid “fuel” substrate tethered to a surface. As such, applicants put forth that the assembly has utility in investigating trail movements of the units across a surface and can be utilized to modify traces in order to deposit metallic materials (see page 6, lines 30-37 of the instant specification) Further, applicants disclose envisioning applications of the assembly that include the targeting of movement on bio-mimetic membranes, nano-patterning, tissue repair, detection of mechanical defects on surfaces, and construction of

intelligent sensors and drug discovery tools (see page 10, lines 10-19 of the instant specification). While applicants asserted applications and potential uses of the claimed invention are found to be specific utilities, they are not found, however, to have both a specific and substantial asserted utility as further noted below.

The above cited applications and uses of the claimed assembly rely upon speculated utilities or generic applications that are not drawn from any well known application of the properties of the instantly claimed invention, namely the modification nucleic acids following attachment to a surface by means of a separate ribozyme or other catalytic nucleic acid enzyme. A review of the pertinent art related to surface attached nucleic acids has not revealed any case of modifying a surface bound nucleic acid sequence by means of a separate catalytic nucleic acid, such as any of the ribozymes disclosed in the instant application as a preferred embodiment for arms of the claimed assembly. In contrast, nucleic acids that are typically tethered/linked to a surface are first prepared and modified to a desired specification prior to being attached to a surface. See for example Goldsborough (U.S. Patent No. 6,794,140), at least column 15, lines 18-39. Therefore, applicants claimed invention drawn to an assembly comprising catalytic leg units that modify tethered nucleic acid “fuel” substrates lacks any substantial utility.

Claims 1-18, 20, and 21 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. This rejection is newly applied. Specifically, since the claimed invention is not supported by either a specific and substantial asserted utility or a well established utility for the

reasons set forth above, one skilled in the art clearly would not know how to use the claimed invention.

Double Patenting

An obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but an examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claims because the examined claim is either anticipated by, or would be obvious over, the reference claims. See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422

F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-18 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-18, 20 and 21 of copending Application No. 10/189,103. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the instantly claimed invention is generically drawn to a macromolecular assembly comprising a body and at least four catalytic nucleic acid leg units, which is anticipated by the copending claims that are more narrowly drawn to a similar macromolecular assembly comprising at least 4 catalytic leg units with specific K_m and K_{cat} values for fuel substrate molecules.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Conclusion

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to Legal Instrument Examiner, Tina Plunkett, whose telephone number is (571) 272-0549.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eric S. DeJong whose telephone number is (571) 272-6099. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM-5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ardin Marschel, Ph.D. can be reached on (571) 272-0718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Patent applicants with problems or questions regarding electronic images that can be viewed in the Patent Application Information Retrieval system (PAIR) can now contact the USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center (Patent EBC) for assistance. Representatives are available to answer your questions daily from 6 am to midnight

Art Unit: 1631

(EST). The toll free number is (866) 217-9197. When calling please have your application serial or patent number, the type of document you are having an image problem with, the number of pages and the specific nature of the problem. The Patent Electronic Business Center will notify applicants of the resolution of the problem within 5-7 business days. Applicants can also check PAIR to confirm that the problem has been corrected. The USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center is a complete service center supporting all patent business on the Internet. The USPTO's PAIR system provides Internet-based access to patent application status and history information. It also enables applicants to view the scanned images of their own application file folder(s) as well as general patent information available to the public.

For all other customer support, please call the USPTO Call Center at (800) 786-9199.

EDJ

EDJ

John S. Brusca 30 January 2006

JOHN S. BRUSCA, PH.D
PRIMARY EXAMINER